

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of: ) Confirmation No. 2329  
Shunpei YAMAZAKI )  
Serial No. 10/772,586 ) Examiner: Thanh T Nguyen  
Filed: February 6, 2004 ) Group Art Unit: 2813  
For METHOD OF MANUFACTURING )  
SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICE AND )  
DISPLAY DEVICE UTILIZING )  
SOLUTION EJECTOR ) October 1, 2006

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION**

**MAIL STOP AF**  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the final Office Action mailed May 30, 2006, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims.

Before proceeding with a detailed analysis of the maintained rejections, it is noted that the Examiner continues to overlook Applicant's arguments pointing out her failure to follow the procedural requirements for setting forth a rejection requirement. In fact, the only statements in the Action made in response to the points raised in the second to fourth paragraphs on page 8 of Applicant's March 13, 2006, Amendment, are the following:

OK for entry  
10/25/06  
Applicant contends that the Examiner failed to identify mutually exclusive species. In response to applicant argument that claims 1-6, 13-18 are producing a semiconductor device and claims 7-12, 19-24 are drawn to producing a display device using a semiconductor device.

The only thing clear about the forgoing statements by the Examiner is that they recite some language from the preambles of the claims. Simply reciting claim features, however, does not explain why restriction should be required. MPEP § 806.04(b) instructs, "Species may be either independent or related under the particular disclosure. Where species under a claimed genus are not connected in any of design, operation, or effect under the disclosure, the species are independent inventions. See MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06. Where inventions